arXiv:1603.07201v1 [math.PR] 23 Mar 2016

A probabilistic analysis of a discrete-time evolution in recombination

Servet Martínez

March 24, 2016

Abstract

We give a closed form of the discrete-time evolution of a recombination transformation in population genetics. This decomposition allows to define a Markov chain in a natural way. We describe the geometric decay rate to the limit distribution, and the quasi-stationary behavior when conditioned to the event that the chain does not hit the limit distribution.

Keywords: Markov chain; Population genetics; Recombination; geometric decay rate; quasi-stationary distributions.

AMS Subject Classification: 60J10; 92D10.

1 Introduction

Here we study the evolution of the following transformation Ξ acting on the set of probability measures μ on a product measurable space $\prod_{i\in I} A_i$,

$$\Xi[\mu] = \sum_{J\subseteq I} \rho_J \, \mu_J \otimes \mu_{J^c}.$$

Here $\rho = (\rho_J : J \subseteq I)$ is a probability vector, μ_J and μ_{J^c} are the marginals of μ on $\prod_{i\in J} A_i$ and $\prod_{i\in J^c} A_i$ respectively, and $\otimes$ means that these marginals are combined in an independent way.

The analysis of Ξ should give an insight in the study of the genetic composition of population under recombination. Genetic information is encoded in terms of sequences of symbols indexed by a finite set of sites. In the process of recombination the children sequences are derived from two parents, a

subset of sites is encoded with the maternal symbols and the complementary set is encoded with the paternal symbols. The above equation expresses that these sets (J, J^c) constitute a probabilistic object distributed according to ρ. A relevant feature is that recombination produces decorrelation between sites and this is expressed by the fact that the sequence distribution on these sets are grouped independently into $\Xi[\mu]$.

The evolution $(\Xi^n[\mu])$ has been mainly studied in the context of single cross-overs, that is where $I = \{1, .., K\}$ and the pairs of sets (J, J^c) are of the form $J = \{i : i < j\}$, $J^c = \{i : i \geq j\}$. This evolution was introduced by H. Geiringer [10], and firstly solved in the continuous-time case by E. Baake and M. Baake [2], where it is also supplied an important corpus of ideas and techniques to study the discrete-time evolution. In relation to the discrete-time evolution we refer to [3]: *'...the corresponding discrete-time dynamics, which is prevalent in the biological literature, is more difficult: its solution has, so far, required nontrivial transformations and recursions that have not been solved in closed form (Benett 1954; Dawson 2000, 2002; von Wangenheim et al. 2010).'* These last works are cited in our list of references as [5]; [8], [9]; [14].

Richer discussions on the interpretation of the above equation in a broader perspective of recombination in population genetics, are given in the introductory sections of references [2], [3], [4] and [13].

When studying single cross-over recombination, one the main objectives in [13] and [3] is to express the iterated $\Xi^n[\mu]$ in a simple form. The main tools in these works are Möbius inversion formulae, similarly to the continuous case, and commutation relations between Ξ and recombination operators. Some of the main results of these works are the one step recursive relation stated in Theorem 1 in [3], Proposition 3.3 in [13] stating that if one starts from a distribution μ then $\Xi^n[\mu]$ converges to the Bernoulli distribution having the marginals of μ, and the relation to ancestry trees and Markov chains, summarized in Theorem 3 in [3].

In our work we present two main results, these are Theorems 4.2 and 5.5.

In Theorem 4.2 we write $\Xi^n[\mu]$ as a weighted decomposition of $\otimes_{\ell\in\delta}\mu_\ell$, where μ_ℓ is the marginal μ on the set ℓ, and $\{\ell \in \delta\}$ are the atoms of some partition δ of I, and we give exactly the weights of this decomposition. This follows from a simple backward development of $\Xi^n[\mu]$ done in Lemma 4.1. When looking in detail the formulae stated in Theorem 4.2 one realizes that they define a natural Markov chain (Y_n) on the set of partitions of I, having the remarkable property that when it starts from the coarsest partition $\{I\}$, then the probability that $\{Y_n = \delta\}$ is equal to the sum of weights of all trees

participating in the backward development of $\Xi^n[\mu]$ whose set of leaves is $\{\ell \in \delta\}$. These results are Lemmas 5.1 and 5.3.

In Theorem 5.5 we use this Markov chain to describe the geometric coefficient of convergence to the limit distribution $\otimes_{\ell\in\mathcal{D}^\rho}\mu_\ell$, where $\mathcal{D}^\rho$ is the partition generated by the sets $\{J : \rho_J > 0\}$. In the single cross-over case the atoms of this partition are the singletons, so the limit probability measure is the Bernoulli distribution. A key result is formula (34) that characterizes the geometric decay behavior. In this Theorem we also study in detail the limiting conditional behavior of the chain when conditioned to the fact that it has not hit the limit distribution. Besides giving the limiting conditional distribution, we state a ratio limit of the probabilities of not hitting the limit distribution. We emphasize that these last results are not a consequence of any known result in the theory of quasi-stationary distributions because the Markov chain (Y_n) is not irreducible on the class of non-absorbing states, so we are not able to use the Perron-Frobenius theory. All these results require entirely new computations. Quasi-stationary distributions have been studied mostly in relation to population extinction, see for instance Section 2.6 in [11], and [12, 6] for a wide ranging bibliography on the subject. In our context the absorbing state is not the void population as happens in extinction, and a main interest of the quasi-limiting behavior is in the process that never hit the limit distribution which is given in Corollary 5.7.

In Section 2 we fix notation on partitions, atoms, and dyadic partitions. In Section 3 we define supply some technical lemmas on the transformation Ξ. Thus, in Lemma 3.7 we get the marginal $\Xi[\mu]_K$ for K a union of atoms, in terms of some iterated coefficients ρ_M^K derived from ρ which constitute key quantities along all our study. In Section 4 we introduce the dyadic family of trees depending on the support of ρ participating in the tree decomposition of $\Xi^n[\mu]$. Finally, in Section 5 we introduce the Markov chain on partitions and state our main results on the quasi-limiting behavior.

Let us discuss briefly the relations of our results with respect to previous literature mainly with respect to [13] and [3], which have been an important inspiration for our work. In these references a Markov chain on partitions was introduced for single cross-over recombination, by following the ancestry of the genetic material of a selected individual from a population and using some limits arguments. As a consequence of this rather complicated construction, a key relation between the Markov chain and the coefficients of the iterated $\Xi^n[\mu]$ is stated in Theorem 3 in [3], which must be the same relation we state in Lemma 5.3. We note, that each backward step in ancestry involves a probabilistic object because the dyadic partition (J, J^c) is randomly distributed. But, our approach differs with the one used in [3] at

some substantial points: we get a closed form of $\Xi^n[\mu]$ by using a simple backward decomposition and this decomposition suggests the definition of the Markov chain (Y_n) in a very natural way. Our techniques are totally different to those used in [13] and [3]. Also, our result apply to all kind of dyadic partitions (J, J^c) that can have a complex combinatorics and not only for the ones arising in the single cross-over case. Finally, the study of the quasi-stationary behavior of this chain is, to our knowledge, firstly studied in this monograph.

We point out that even if our results are stated for a product of finite spaces, they can be stated for general product of measurable spaces as pointed out in Remark 5.9.

Recently, in [4], the continuous-time evolution was studied in a framework of general partitions other than dyadic partitions. The extension of our results to the analogous framework but for discrete-time, deserves a different study.

It is worth mentioning, that in Section 3 and in the final comment of this work, we point out that all our results remain true when $\otimes$ is a commutative and associative operation, it has an identity element and is also stable under restriction. It could be explored the existence of good candidates for operations $\otimes$ other than the product of probability measures, that would be meaningful in population genetics.

2 Partitions

In this section we fix some notation on partitions. Some emphasis is put in defining a partition from a family of sets, with a special care in defining the atoms, and we make the difference between dyadic and strictly dyadic partitions, the last ones having exactly two atoms.

Let I be a finite set and $\mathbb{S}(I) = \{L : L \subseteq I\}$ be the class of its subsets ($\subseteq$ means inclusion and $\subset$ strict inclusion). For any class of sets $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathbb{S}(I)$ we put $\mathcal{Z}^{(\emptyset)} = \mathcal{Z} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$, $\mathcal{Z}^{(I)} = \mathcal{Z} \setminus \{I\}$ and $\mathcal{Z}^{(\emptyset,I)} = \mathcal{Z} \setminus \{\emptyset, I\}$. So, when $\mathcal{Z}$ does not contain the empty set we have $\mathcal{Z}^{(I)} = \mathcal{Z}^{(\emptyset,I)}$.

A partition $\mathcal{D}$ of I is a collection of nonempty sets (so $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathbb{S}(I)^{(\emptyset)}$), pairwise disjoint and covering I. We note $\mathcal{D} = \{L : L \in \mathcal{D}\}$ and any of the sets L is called an atom of $\mathcal{D}$. We note by $\mathbb{D}(I)$ the family of partitions of I.

For $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}' \in \mathbb{D}(I)$, $\mathcal{D}'$ is said to be finer than $\mathcal{D}$ or $\mathcal{D}$ is coarser than $\mathcal{D}'$, if every atom of $\mathcal{D}'$ is contained in an atom of $\mathcal{D}$. In this case every atom

in $\mathcal{D}$ is union of atoms of $\mathcal{D}'$. The finer partition is the class of singletons $\mathcal{D}_{I,si} = \{\{i\} : i \in I\}$, and the coarsest one is $\{I\}$.

Let $\mathcal{J} \subseteq \mathbb{S}(I)^{(\emptyset)}$ be a nonempty family of nonempty sets which satisfies, $J \in \mathcal{J}, J \neq I \Rightarrow J^c \in \mathcal{J}$. Then, it defines a partition $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{J}) \in \mathbb{D}(I)$ as follows. Let $\mathcal{Y}_1(\mathcal{J}) = \mathcal{J}$ and define by recursion the following family of classes of nonempty sets,

$$\forall\, n \geq 1: \quad \mathcal{Y}_{n+1}(\mathcal{J}) = \{K \cap J : K \in \mathcal{Y}_n(\mathcal{J}), J \in \mathcal{J}, K \cap J \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Since $J \cap J = J$, we have $\mathcal{Y}_n(\mathcal{J}) \subseteq \mathcal{Y}_{n+1}(\mathcal{J})$ for all $n \geq 1$. Also it stabilizes in a finite number of steps, that is there exists $n_0 \geq 1$ such that $\mathcal{Y}_{n_0+k}(\mathcal{J}) = \mathcal{Y}_{n_0}(\mathcal{J})$ for all $k \geq 0$. Let

$$\mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{J}) = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} \mathcal{Y}_n(\mathcal{J}). \tag{1}$$

We define the atoms of the partition $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{J})$ by:

$$L \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{J}) \Leftrightarrow \big[\, L \in \mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{J}) \text{ and } \forall J \in \mathcal{J}:\ J \cap L = L \vee J \cap L = \emptyset \,\big]. \tag{2}$$

It is clear that the atoms $L \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{J})$ are disjoint, on the other hand they cover I, because in the contrary the set $I \setminus (\bigcup_{L \in \mathcal{D}_I(\mathcal{J})} L)$ would have a nonempty intersection with some $J \in \mathcal{J}$ and so it would contain an atom of the form (2) leading to a contradiction. Then, $I = \bigcup_{L \in \mathcal{D}_I(\mathcal{J})} L$. It is also straightforward to show that

$$\forall K \in \mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{J}): \quad K = \bigcup_{L \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{J}): L \subseteq K} L. \tag{3}$$

It is useful to introduce *dyadic* partitions. The set of dyadic partitions on I is noted by $\mathbb{D}_{1,2}(I)$ and it is given by

$$\mathbb{D}_{1,2}(I) = \{I\} \cup \{\{J, J^c\} : J \in \mathbb{S}^{\emptyset,I}(I)\}.$$

The $_{1,2}$ subscript is because a partition $\delta \in \mathbb{D}_{1,2}(I)$ can have one or two atoms. It has one atom only in the case $\delta = \{I\}$, in all other cases it contains two atoms. We will make the distinction with respect to the family of *strictly dyadic* partitions, which is the class of partitions having exactly two atoms,

$$\mathbb{D}_2(I) = \{\{J, J^c\} : J \in \mathbb{S}^{\emptyset,I}(I)\}.$$

From now on, we fix I and call it the set of sites. In the notation of the variables we will often delete the dependence on I, thus we write $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{S}(I)$, $\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{D}(I)$, $\mathbb{D}_{1,2} = \mathbb{D}_{1,2}(I)$, $\mathbb{D}_2 = \mathbb{D}_2(I)$ and so on. But we keep the dependence of these quantities on a set J when it is not necessarily I, in this case we write $\mathbb{S}(J)$, $\mathbb{D}(J)$, $\mathbb{D}_{1,2}(J)$, $\mathbb{D}_2(J)$ and so on.

3 The recombination transformation

In this section we define the action of Ξ on the set of probability of measures of a product measurable space. For simplicity we assume the product space is finite, in fact all our results remain true for a product of general measurable spaces. But, the finiteness of the set of sites I is crucial. We will supply some elementary properties of Ξ, a main one being the description of the marginal of the transformed probability measure, this is done in Lemma 3.7. This description is written in terms of some coefficients whose main properties are summarized in Lemma 3.6. We devote some time to state exactly the properties of $\otimes$ that will used in this work.

Let A_i be a finite set for $i \in I$, called the alphabet on site i. Let $\prod_{i\in I} A_i$ be the product space. In order that our statements are for non-trivial, we will assume that the sets I and A_i for $i = 1, .., n$, contain at least two elements.

We note by x an element of $\prod_{i\in I} A_i$, so $x = (x_i \in A_i : i \in I)$. Denote by $\mathcal{P}_I$ the set of probability measures on $\prod_{i\in I} A_i$. Any $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_I$ is determined by the values $(\mu(x) : x \in \prod_{i\in I} A_i)$. Let $J \in \mathbb{S}$. We note $x_J = (x_i : i \in J)$ and make the identification $x = (x_J, x_{J^c})$. We denote by $\mathcal{P}_J$ the set of probability measures on $\prod_{i\in J} A_i$.

The marginal $\mu_J \in \mathcal{P}_J$ of $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_I$ on J is,

$$\forall x_J \in \prod_{i\in J} A_i : \quad \mu_J(x_J) := \mu(\{y \in \prod_{i\in I} A_i : y_i = x_i\}) = \sum_{x_{J^c}\in\prod_{i\in J^c} A_i} \mu(x). \quad (4)$$

For $J = I$ we have $\mu_I = \mu$, and for $J = \emptyset$ we have $\mu_\emptyset(x_\emptyset) = 1$. We put $\mu_\emptyset \equiv 1$ to get consistency in all the relations where it will appear.

If $K \subseteq J$ then the marginal μ_K can be defined from μ_J, that is it satisfies

$$\mu_K(x_K) = \sum_{x_{J\setminus K}\in\prod_{i\in J\setminus K} A_i} \mu_J(x_J). \quad (5)$$

We take $\otimes$ to be the product measure: for all $\mu^J \in \mathcal{P}_J$, $\mu^K \in \mathcal{P}_K$,

$$\forall x_{J\cup K} \in \prod_{i\in J\cup K} A_i : \quad \mu^J \otimes \mu^K(x_{J\cup K}) = \mu^J(x_J)\mu^K(x_K).$$

Let us explicit the properties we will use from $\otimes$. First, the operation $\otimes$ is defined in the domains

$$\forall J, K \in \mathbb{S}, J \cap K = \emptyset; \quad \otimes : \mathcal{P}_J \times \mathcal{P}_K \to \mathcal{P}_{J\cup K}. \quad (6)$$

The operation $\otimes$ is commutative and associative, that is for $J, K, M \in \mathbb{S}$ pairwise disjoint, $\mu^J \in \mathcal{P}_J$, $\mu^K \in \mathcal{P}_K$, $\mu^M \in \mathcal{P}_M$, it is satisfied

$$\mu^J \otimes \mu^K = \mu^K \otimes \mu^J \text{ and } (\mu^J \otimes \mu^K) \otimes \mu^M = \mu^J \otimes (\mu^K \otimes \mu^M). \tag{7}$$

Moreover, $\mu^\emptyset \equiv 1$ is an identity element for $\otimes$, and $\otimes$ satisfies the following stability property under restriction.

Lemma 3.1. *For all $J, K, M \in \mathbb{S}$ with $J \cap K = \emptyset$ and $M \subseteq J \cup K$,*

$$(\mu_J \otimes \mu_K)_M = \mu_{J\cap M} \otimes \mu_{K\cap M}. \tag{8}$$

Proof. This is a consequence of definition (4) and property (5). In fact

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mu_J \otimes \mu_K)_M(x_{(J\cup K)\cap M}) &= \sum_{x_{(J\cup K)\setminus M}} (\mu_J \otimes \mu_K)(x_{J\cup K}) \\
&= \sum_{(x_{J\setminus M}, x_{K\setminus M})} \mu_J(x_J) \cdot \mu_K(x_K) \\
&= \left(\sum_{x_{J\setminus M}} \mu_J(x_J)\right)\left(\sum_{x_{K\setminus M}} \mu_K(x_K)\right) \\
&= \mu_{J\cap M}(x_{J\cap M}) \cdot \mu_{K\cap M}(x_{K\cap M}) \\
&= (\mu_{J\cap M} \otimes \mu_{K\cap M})(x_{(J\cap M)\cup(K\cap M)}).
\end{aligned}$$

□

The above properties (6), (7), (8), and $\mu^\emptyset$ an identity, are all we need from $\otimes$ to get the results of this work.

Note that commutation and associativity imply that $\bigotimes_{L\in\mathcal{D}} \mu_L \in \mathcal{P}_I$ is well-defined for a partition $\mathcal{D}$ of I.

For $\otimes$ the product measure we have

$$\forall x \in \prod_{i\in I} A_i : \quad \bigotimes_{L\in\mathcal{D}} \mu_L(x) = \prod_{L\in\mathcal{D}} \mu_L(x_L).$$

If $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}^{si} = \{\{i\} : i \in I\}$, $\bigotimes_{i\in I} \mu_{\{i\}}$ is called Bernoulli and $(\mu^{\{i\}} : i \in I)$ are the one-site marginals.

From now on, we fix $\rho = (\rho_J : J \in \mathbb{S})$ a probability vector, so $\rho_J \geq 0$ for $J \in \mathbb{S}$ and $\sum_{J\in\mathbb{S}} \rho_J = 1$, and that also satisfies $\rho_\emptyset = 0$.

Definition 3.2. *Define the following transformation* $\Xi : \mathcal{P}_I \to \mathcal{P}_I$,

$$\Xi[\mu] = \sum_{J \in \mathbb{S}} \rho_J \, \mu_J \otimes \mu_{J^c} = \sum_{J \in \mathbb{S}^{(\emptyset)}} \rho_J \, \mu_J \otimes \mu_{J^c}. \tag{9}$$

□

Since $\mu_\emptyset \equiv 1$, then

$$\Xi[\mu] = \rho_I \, \mu + \sum_{J \in \mathbb{S}^{\emptyset, I}} \rho_J \, \mu_J \otimes \mu_{J^c}. \tag{10}$$

Remark 3.3. *We have* $\rho_\emptyset = 0$, *but we can have* $\rho_I > 0$. *On the other hand, since* $\mu_J \otimes \mu_{J^c} = \mu_{J^c} \otimes \mu_J$, *we can assume when it is needed that* $\rho_J = \rho_{J^c}$ *for* $J \in \mathbb{S}^{(\emptyset, I)}$.

Observe that formula (9) can be written in terms of dyadic and strictly dyadic partitions as,

$$\Xi[\mu] = \sum_{\mathcal{D} \in \mathbb{D}_{1,2}} (\sum_{K \in \mathcal{D}} \rho_K) \bigotimes_{K \in \mathcal{D}} \mu_K = \rho_I \mu + \sum_{\mathcal{D} \in \mathbb{D}_2} (\sum_{K \in \mathcal{D}} \rho_K) \bigotimes_{K \in \mathcal{D}} \mu_K.$$

Let

$$\mathcal{J}_\rho = \{J \in \mathbb{S}^{(\emptyset)} : \rho_J > 0\}$$

be the support of ρ, so $\mathcal{J}_\rho^{(I)} = \{J \in \mathbb{S}^{(\emptyset, I)} : \rho_J > 0\}$ is the class of nonempty subsets strictly contained in I which are in the support of ρ. Denote by

$$D^\rho := \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{J}_\rho)$$

the partition generated by the class of sets $\mathcal{J}_\rho$, whose atoms satisfy (2) with $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}_\rho$.

Lemma 3.4. (*i*) *Let* M *be contained in an atom in* $\mathcal{D}^\rho$, *then* Ξ *preserves the marginal on* M, *that is*

$$[M \subseteq L, L \in \mathcal{D}^\rho] \Rightarrow \Xi[\mu]_M = \mu_M. \tag{11}$$

(*ii*) *Let* $\mathcal{D}$ *be a partition finer than* $\mathcal{D}^\rho$ (*so* $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}^\rho$ *is allowed*), *and* $\mu^L \in \mathcal{P}_L$ *for* $L \in \mathcal{D}$. *Then,* $\mu = \bigotimes_{L \in \mathcal{D}} \mu^L$ *is a fixed point for* Ξ, *that is* $\Xi[\mu] = \mu$.

Proof. (i) From (8) we have $(\mu_J \otimes \mu_{J^c})_M = \mu_{J\cap M} \otimes \mu_{J^c\cap M}$. From (2) and since $M \subseteq L \in \mathcal{D}^\rho$, we get that every $J \in \mathcal{J}_\rho$ satisfies: $J^c \subseteq M^c$ or $J \subseteq M^c$. Then $(\mu_J \otimes \mu_{J^c})_M = \mu_M$.

(ii) For every $L \in \mathcal{D}$ we have $\mu_L = \mu^L$ for all $L \in \mathcal{D}$. From (3) we get,

$$\forall J \in \mathcal{J}_\rho : \quad \mu_J = \bigotimes_{L\in\mathcal{D}:L\subseteq J} \mu^L.$$

Since the sets in the families $\{L \in \mathcal{D} : L \subseteq J\}$ and $\{L \in \mathcal{D} : L \subseteq J^c\}$, are disjoint and their union is I, we get $\mu_J \otimes \mu_{J^c} = \bigotimes_{L\in\mathcal{D}} \mu^L = \mu$. Hence $\Xi[\mu] = \mu$. □

As consequence of Lemma 3.4 (ii) we get that the one-site marginals $\mu_{\{i\}}$ are preserved by Ξ, and the Bernoulli probability measures are fixed points of Ξ.

When $\rho_I = 1$, so $\Xi[\mu] = \mu$ and Ξ is the identity transformation. Then, in the sequel we assume

$$\rho_I < 1 \text{ or equivalently } \mathcal{J}_\rho^{(I)} \neq \emptyset.$$

We recall the notation in (1), $\mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{J}_\rho)$ is the class of all nonempty intersections of sets in $\mathcal{J}_\rho$. For $K \in \mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{J}_\rho)$ we define,

$$K \cap \mathcal{J}_\rho = \{K \cap J : J \in \mathcal{J}\}.$$

We have $K \in K \cap \mathcal{J}_\rho$ and $K \cap \mathcal{J}_\rho \subseteq \mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{J}_\rho) \cup \{\emptyset\}$.

Definition 3.5. *For all $K \in \mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{J}_\rho)$, $M \in (K \cap \mathcal{J}_\rho)^{(\emptyset)}$ we define*

$$\rho_M^K = \sum_{J\in\mathcal{J}_\rho:J\cap K=M} \rho_J \text{ if } M \neq K \text{ and } \rho_K^K = \sum_{J\in\mathcal{J}_\rho:J\cap K=K\vee J\cap K=\emptyset} \rho_M. \tag{12}$$

□

By definition the above quantities are positive: $\rho_M^K > 0$ and $\rho_K^K > 0$. For all $K \in \mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{J}_\rho)$ we have

$$\sum_{M\in(K\cap\mathcal{J}_\rho)^{(\emptyset)}} \rho_M^K = \sum_{M\in K\cap\mathcal{J}_\rho} \sum_{J\in\mathcal{J}_\rho:J\cap K=M} \rho_J = \sum_{J\in\mathcal{J}_\rho} \rho_J = 1. \tag{13}$$

Then, $\rho_\bullet^K = (\rho_M^K : M \in (K \cap \mathcal{J}_\rho)^{(\emptyset)})$ is a probability vector.

In particular $\rho_J^J \geq \rho_J + \rho_{J^c} > 0$ for all $J \in \mathcal{J}_\rho^{(I)}$ and when $I \in \mathcal{J}_\rho$ then, $\rho_I^I = \rho_I$ and $\rho_K^I = \rho_K$ for $K \in \mathcal{J}_\rho^{(I)}$.

Lemma 3.6. (i) *We have:*

$$\forall K \in \mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{J}_\rho), M \in (K \cap \mathcal{J}_\rho)^{(\emptyset)}, M \neq K: \quad \rho_K^K < \rho_M^M. \tag{14}$$

When we assume $\rho_J = \rho_{J^c}$ *for* $J \in \mathcal{J}_\rho^{(I)}$*, we get*

$$\forall K \in \mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{J}_\rho), M \in (J \cap \mathcal{J}_\rho)^{(\emptyset)}, M \neq K: \quad \rho_M^K = \rho_{K\setminus M}^K. \tag{15}$$

(ii) *The atoms of* $\mathcal{D}^\rho$ *are characterized by the following relation:*

$$\forall L \in \mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{J}_\rho): \quad L \in \mathcal{D}^\rho \Leftrightarrow \rho_L^L = 1. \tag{16}$$

Proof. (i) Let us show (14). For $J \in \mathcal{J}_\rho$ we have:

$$\big[J \cap K = M \Rightarrow J \cap M = M\big] \text{ and } \big[J \cap K = \emptyset \Rightarrow J \cap M = \emptyset\big].$$

Hence, from definition (12) we get $\rho_K^K \leq \rho_M^M$. For showing the strict inequality we use that there exists some $J \in \mathcal{J}_\rho^{(I)}$ such that $J \cap K = M$. Note that $J^c \cap K \neq \emptyset$ but $J^c \cap M = \emptyset$, then $\rho_K^K < \rho_M^M$, so (14) is proven.

The relation (15) follows from

$$J \in \mathcal{J}_\rho: \quad J \cap K = M \Rightarrow J^c \cap K = K \setminus M,$$

and $\rho_J = \rho_{J^c}$ for $J \in \mathcal{J}_\rho^{(I)}$. In fact, both relations imply

$$\sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}_\rho^{(I)}: J\cap K = M} \rho_J = \sum_{J^c \in \mathcal{J}_\rho^{(I)}: J^c \cap K = K\setminus M} \rho_{J^c}\ .$$

(ii) Let us show the equivalence (16). The implication $(\Rightarrow)$ is a direct consequence of $L \cap J = L$ or $L \cap J = \emptyset$ for $J \in \mathcal{J}_\rho$. The converse relation $(\Leftarrow)$ is deduced from the fact that $\rho_L^L = 1$ happens if and only if $L \cap J = L$ or $L \cap J = \emptyset$ for $J \in \mathcal{J}_\rho$, but since $L \in \mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{J}_\rho)$, from (2) we get that L is necessarily an atom of $\mathcal{D}^\rho$. □

Lemma 3.7. *Let* $K \in \mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{J}_\rho)$*. Then, the marginal* $\Xi[\mu]_K$ *of* $\Xi[\mu]$ *on* K*, satisfies*

$$\Xi[\mu]_K = \rho_K^K\, \mu + \sum_{M \in (K\cap\mathcal{J}_\rho)^{(\emptyset,K)}} \rho_M^K\, \mu_M \otimes \mu_{K\setminus M}.$$

Proof. Since $J \cap K = M$ implies $J^c \cap K = K \setminus M$, from (8) we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned}\Xi[\mu]_K &= \sum_{J\in\mathbb{S}^\emptyset} \rho_J(\mu_J \otimes \mu_{J^c})_K = \sum_{J\in\mathbb{S}^\emptyset} \rho_J\, \mu_{J\cap K} \otimes \mu_{J^c\cap K} \\ &= \left(\sum_{J\in\mathbb{S}^\emptyset: J\cap K = K \vee J\cap K=\emptyset} \rho_J\right)\mu_K + \sum_{M\in(K\cap\mathcal{J}_\rho)^{(\emptyset,K)}} \left(\sum_{J\in\mathbb{S}^\emptyset: J\cap K = M} \rho_J\right)\mu_M \otimes \mu_{K\setminus M} \\ &= \rho_K^K\, \mu_K + \sum_{M\in(K\cap\mathcal{J}_\rho)^{(\emptyset,K)}} \rho_M^K\, \mu_M \otimes \mu_{K\setminus M}.\end{aligned}$$

□

Let us define the following kernel $f_{\mathcal{D}}^K$ between sets $K \in \mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{J}_\rho)$ and dyadic partitions $\mathcal{D} \in \mathbb{D}_{1,2}(K)$. We set

$$f^K(\{K\}) = \rho_K^K \text{ and } f^K(\{M, K\setminus M\}) = \rho_M^K + \rho_{K\setminus M}^K \text{ if } M \in (K\cap\mathcal{J}_\rho)^{(\emptyset,K)}. \tag{17}$$

Then, equality (13) can be written in terms of dyadic partitions,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\mathcal{D}\in\mathbb{D}_{1,2}(K)} f_{\mathcal{D}}^K &= f^K(\{K\}) + \sum_{\{M,K\setminus M\}\in\mathbb{D}_2(K)} f^K(\{M, K\setminus M\}) \\ &= \rho_K^K + \sum_{\{M,K\setminus M\}\in\mathbb{D}_2(K)} (\rho_M^K + \rho_{K\setminus M}^K) = 1. \end{aligned}\tag{18}$$

In the following sections we will present our main results. We note that there will be cases in which these results will be trivial, for instance when $\mathcal{J}_\rho = \{I\}$ or $\mathcal{J}_\rho = \{J, J^c\}$ for some $J \in \mathbb{S}^{(\emptyset,I)}$, but they will be not listed in detail. We will assume that the sets I, A_i, $i \in I$, and $\mathcal{J}_\rho$, are sufficiently big in order that the statements of our results make sense and are not trivial.

4 The recursive equation in terms of trees

In this Section we supply the first of our main results, the decomposition of $\Xi^n[\mu]$ in terms of product marginal measures, where the marginals are the atoms of some partitions. This is done in Theorem 4.2. It requires to introduce some dyadic trees because the atoms of the partitions are exactly the set of leaves of some dyadic trees.

To expand $\Xi^n[\mu]$ for $n \geq 1$, we require to introduce further notation. Let us describe a class of rooted dyadic trees whose nodes are sets, in fact they are elements of $\mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{J}_\rho)$. The dyadic property means that each parent node has

one or two children: if it has one children the set associated to the children is the same as the one of the parent, and when it has two children the set of the parent is partitioned into two disjoint nonempty sets by some set in $\mathcal{J}_\rho^{(I)}$, and these are the sets associated to the children. The set I will be the root of all these trees.

Let us be more precise in notation and concepts. We note by $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{J}_\rho)$ the family of dyadic trees rooted by I, which depends on $\mathcal{J}_\rho$, and that we will construct in an inductive way. The recursion will depend on the length $|T|$ of a tree $T \in \mathcal{T}$, so the classes $\mathcal{T}_n = \{T \in \mathcal{T} : |T| = n\}$ will be defined in a recursive way for $n \geq 0$.

A tree $T \in \mathcal{T}$ is defined as the set of its branches. A branch $b \in T$ is a tuple of elements in $\mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{J}_\rho)$ and its last component is called its leaf and noted $\ell(b)$. The set of leaves of the tree T is

$$\partial(T) = \{\ell(b) : b \in T\},$$

and a leaf of T is simply noted $\ell \in \partial(T)$. As a consequence of our construction of $\mathcal{T}$, all the branches b of a tree $T \in \mathcal{T}$ will have the same length, so $|b| = |T|$. Any of these branches is written $b = (b_0, .., b_{|T|})$, and so $b_{|T|} = \ell(b)$.

Below, the algorithm of construction of $\mathcal{T}$ is given as a recursive definition of $(\mathcal{T}_n : n \geq 0)$.

For $n = 0$, the class $\mathcal{T}_0$ is a singleton formed by the unique tree $T = \{I\}$. So, it that has a unique branch $b = (I)$ with leaf $\ell(b) = I$. The length of T is by definition $|T| = 0$, so $|b| = 0$ and $b_0 = I$.

Assume we have constructed the set of trees $\mathcal{T}_n$. We will construct $\mathcal{T}_{n+1}$ by using the following algorithm:

Take $T \in \mathcal{T}_n$. It generates a family of trees in $\mathcal{T}_{n+1}$, where each one of these trees is the result of adding either one or two nodes, to each leaf of T. So, any of the choices made for the leaves $\ell \in \partial T$, defines a tree $T' \in \mathcal{T}_{n+1}$. To be precise let $b = (b_0, .., b_n)$ be a branch in T, then:

- If we are not in the case $(n = 0, \rho_I = 0)$, b can generate the branch $b' = (b_0, .., b_n, b_n)$, so with $b_{n+1} = b_n$;
- If $\ell(b)$ is not an atom in $\mathcal{D}^\rho$, b can generate two branches b' and b''. This is done by partitioning the set $\ell(b)$ into a pair of nonempty sets $\{\ell(b) \cap J, \ell(b) \cap J^c\}$ with some $J \in \mathcal{J}_\rho^{(I)}$. The two branches generated by b are respectively $b' = (b, \ell(b) \cap J)$ and $b'' = (b, \ell(b) \cap J^c)$, so these branches share all the nodes with b except that we have added to them and extra node, these are their leaves $\ell(b) \cap J$ and $\ell(b) \cap J^c$ respectively.

We have specified the possible choices on the branches of T, but as it can be easily checked we could also performed it in terms of $\partial(T)$. As said, once a choice is made for the whole set of branches $\{b \in T\}$, or equivalently for all the leaves $\{\ell \in \partial(T)\}$, a tree T' of length $|T'| = |T| + 1$ is defined from T, or equivalently a partition $\partial(T')$ is defined from $\partial(T)$. When this happens we put

$$T \to T' \text{ or equivalently } \partial(T) \to \partial(T'), \tag{19}$$

which defines a relation in $\mathcal{T}$ or equivalently in $\partial(\mathcal{T}) = \{\partial(T) : T \in \mathcal{T}\}$.

Thus, a tree $T \in \mathcal{T}_1$ can have the following shapes: either it has one branch (I, I) in which case I is the unique leaf (this can happen only when $\rho_I > 0$); or it can have two branches $\{(I, J), (I, J^c)\}$ for some $J \in \mathcal{J}_\rho^{(I)}$, and so with leaves J and J^c respectively.

The family of rooted trees constructed as above but with root K instead of I, is noted by $\mathcal{T}^K$. So, $\mathcal{T}_n^K$ refers to the class of the trees in $\mathcal{T}^K$ of length n. With this notation the recursive step to construct $\mathcal{T}_{n+1}$ from $\mathcal{T}_n$, can be summarized by saying that a tree $T \in \mathcal{T}_n$ generates a family of trees $T' \in \mathcal{T}_{n+1}$, each T' is the result of a choice of a family of trees $(T'^\ell \in \mathcal{T}_1^\ell : \ell \in \partial(T))$, being T'^ℓ attached to ℓ.

In the next result, μ_ℓ refers to the marginal probability measure μ on the set ℓ.

Lemma 4.1. *For every $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_I$, for all $n \geq 1$ and all $j \leq n$, the following relation is satisfied,*

$$\Xi^n[\mu] = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_j} \left(\sum_{b \in T} \prod_{r=1}^{|b|} \rho_{b_r}^{b_{r-1}} \right) \bigotimes_{\ell \in \partial(T)} (\Xi^{n-j}[\mu])_\ell \tag{20}$$

$$= \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_j} \left(\sum_{b \in T} \prod_{r=1}^{|b|} \rho_{b_r}^{b_{r-1}} \right) \left(\bigotimes_{\ell \in \partial(T) \setminus \mathcal{D}^\rho} \Xi^{n-j}[\mu]_\ell \right) \otimes \left(\bigotimes_{\ell \in \partial(T) \cap D^\rho} \mu_\ell \right). \tag{21}$$

(We note $\prod_{r=1}^{|b|} = 1$ when $|b| = 0$.)

Proof. First of all, by using Lemma 3.4 (i) the expression (20) becomes (21). So, we only need to show (20). This is done by recurrence on $n \geq 1$.

Let $n = 1$. The development made for the family of trees $\mathcal{T}_1$, implies that the relation (9) can be written as

$$\Xi[\mu] = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_1} \left(\sum_{b \in T} \rho_{b_1}^{b_0} \right) \bigotimes_{\ell \in \partial(T)} \mu_\ell.$$

Then, (20) is satisfied for $n = 1$. Now, assume we have shown (20) for some $n-1$, let show it for n.

First take $j < n$. By recurrence hypothesis, we can apply formula (20) to $n-1$, j and $\Xi[\mu]$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\Xi^n[\mu] &= \Xi^{n-1}(\Xi[\mu]) \\ &= \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_j}\left(\sum_{b\in T}\prod_{r=1}^{|b|}\rho_{b_r}^{b_{r-1}}\right)\bigotimes_{\ell\in\partial(T)}(\Xi^{n-1-j}[\Xi[\mu]])_\ell \\ &= \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_j}\left(\sum_{b\in T}\prod_{r=1}^{|b|}\rho_{b_r}^{b_{r-1}}\right)\bigotimes_{\ell\in\partial(T)}(\Xi^{n-j}[\mu])_\ell.\end{aligned}$$

Then the formula (20) holds for n, j and μ.

Now take $j = n$. By recurrence hypothesis and by using Lemma 3.7 we get

$$\begin{aligned}\Xi^n[\mu] &= \Xi^{n-1}[\Xi[\mu]] \\ &= \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_{n-1}}\left(\sum_{b\in T}\prod_{r=1}^{|b|}\rho_{b_r}^{b_{r-1}}\right)\bigotimes_{\ell\in\partial(T)}\Xi[\mu]_\ell \\ &= \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_{n-1}}\left(\sum_{b\in T}\prod_{r=1}^{|b|}\rho_{b_r}^{b_{r-1}}\right)\bigotimes_{\ell\in\partial(T)}\left(\sum_{T'^\ell\in\mathcal{T}_1^\ell}\left(\sum_{b'\in T'^\ell}\rho_{b'_1}^{b'_0}\right)\bigotimes_{\ell'\in\partial(T'^\ell)}\mu_{\ell'}\right) \quad (22) \\ &= \sum_{T^*\in\mathcal{T}_n}\left(\sum_{b\in T^*}\prod_{r=1}^{|b^*|}\rho_{b_r^*}^{b_{r-1}^*}\right)\bigotimes_{\ell^*\in\partial(T^*)}\mu_{\ell^*}. \quad (23)\end{aligned}$$

In (22) we set $b_{|b|} = b'_0$. On the other hand, in (23) we used,

$$\bigotimes_{\ell^*\in\partial(T^*)}\mu_{\ell^*} = \bigotimes_{\ell\in\partial(T)}\left(\bigotimes_{\ell'\in\partial(T'^\ell)}\mu_{\ell'}\right),$$

and

$$\prod_{r=1}^{|b^*|}\rho_{b_r^*}^{b_{r-1}^*} = \left(\prod_{r=1}^{|b|}\rho_{b_r}^{b_{r-1}}\right)\rho_{b'_1}^{b'_0} \text{ for } b_s^* = b_s \text{ for } s \le |b|, \text{ and } b_{|b|+1}^* = b'_1,$$

for the tree T^* formed by adding $T'^\ell \in \mathcal{T}^\ell$ to each leaf $\ell \in \partial(T)$. Hence, the result is shown. □

We will note by $\partial(\mathcal{T}_n) = \{\partial(T) : T \in \mathcal{T}_n\}$.

Theorem 4.2. *For every probability measure $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_I$ and all $n \geq 1$, we get the following decomposition*

$$\Xi^n[\mu] = \sum_{\delta \in \partial(\mathcal{T}_n)} q_\delta^n \bigotimes_{\ell \in \delta} \mu_\ell, \tag{24}$$

where the vector $q^n = (q_\delta^n : \delta \in \partial(\mathcal{T}_n)$ is given by,

$$q_\delta^n = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_n : \partial(T) = \delta} \left(\sum_{b \in T} \prod_{r=1}^{|b|} \rho_{b_r}^{b_{r-1}} \right), \tag{25}$$

and it is a probability vector, so it satisfies

$$\sum_{\delta \in \partial(\mathcal{T}_n)} q_\delta^n = 1. \tag{26}$$

Proof. By taking $j = n$ in (20) we get,

$$\Xi^n[\mu] = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_n} \left(\sum_{b \in T} \prod_{r=1}^{|b|} \rho_{b_r}^{b_{r-1}} \right) \bigotimes_{\ell \in \partial(T)} \mu_\ell. \tag{27}$$

So, by using definition (25), the equality (24) is shown. Since (27) expresses that the probability measure $\Xi^n[\mu]$ is a positive linear combination of the set of probability measures $(\bigotimes_{\ell \in \partial(T)} \mu_\ell : T \in \mathcal{T}_n)$, we deduce it is necessarily a convex linear combination, that is

$$\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_n} \left(\sum_{b \in T} \prod_{r=1}^{|b|} \rho_{b_r}^{b_{r-1}} \right) = 1.$$

But this is exactly (26). The result is shown. □

Then, in the expansion (24) $\Xi^n[\mu]$ has a weight q_δ^n of being the product probability measure $\otimes_{\ell \in \delta} \mu_\ell$.

Remark 4.3. *In the following section we will use some properties of the relation $\to$ on $\partial(\mathcal{T})$ defined in (19). We have that $\to$ is an order relation and $\delta \to \delta'$ implies that δ' is finer than δ (finer includes equal). Also, for all $\delta \in \partial(\mathcal{T})$, $\delta \neq \{I\}$, there exists a path $\delta_1 = \{I\} \to ... \to \delta_k = \delta$ from $\{I\}$ to δ, and $\{I\} \to \{I\}$ only when $\rho_I > 0$. On the ordered space $(\partial(\mathcal{T}), \to)$ we*

can say that δ' is a successor of δ when $\delta \to \delta'$ in a consistent way because $(\delta_1 \to ... \to \delta_k,\ \delta_1 \neq \delta_k)$ implies $\delta_k \not\to \delta_1$. But the ordered space $(\partial(\mathcal{T}), \to)$ is in general not a tree. For instance if the elements I, J_1, J_2 are three different elements of $\mathcal{J}_\rho$, and the intersections $J_1 \cap J_2$, $J_1^c \cap J_2$, $J_1^c \cap J_2$ and $J_1^c \cap J_2^c$ are nonempty, then

$$\{I\} \to \{J_1, J_1^c\} \to \{J_1 \cap J_2, J_1^c \cap J_2, J_2^c\} \to \{J_1 \cap J_2, J_1^c \cap J_2, J_1 \cap J_2^c, J_1^c \cap J_2^c\}$$

and

$$\{I\} \to \{J_2, J_2^c\} \to \{J_1 \cap J_2, J_1 \cap J_2^c, J_1^c\} \to \{J_1 \cap J_2, J_1 \cap J_2^c, J_1^c \cap J_2, J_1^c \cap J_2^c\}$$

are two different paths from $\{I\}$ to $\{J_1 \cap J_2, J_1^c \cap J_2, J_1 \cap J_2^c, J_1^c \cap J_2^c\}$, having in common only the initial and final points. So, $\{J_1 \cap J_2, J_1^c \cap J_2, J_1 \cap J_2^c, J_1^c \cap J_2^c\}$ has at least two predecessors.

5 Markov chain, geometric convergence and quasi-stationarity

In this section we supply our main results. Firstly, the definition of a natural Markov chain associated to $(\Xi^n : n \geq 0)$ is done in Lemmas 5.1 and 5.3. The main results are the description of this chain found in Theorem 5.5. Since the orbit $(\Xi^n[\mu])$, converges to the product of the marginal probability measures on the atoms of the partition $\mathcal{D}^\rho$, we study geometric convergence to the limit probability measure. We give the geometric decay rate, and we study the ratio limit and the quasi-stationary behavior of the chain. This last study responds to the following question: if the chain has not arrived to the limit probability measure after a long time, which is its distribution? Finally, in Corollary 5.7 we supply the Markov chain that never hit the limit distribution.

The relations (24), (25) and (26) of Theorem 4.2 will be at the basis of the construction of a Markov chain $Y = (Y_n : n \geq 0)$ taking values on $\partial(\mathcal{T})$ and having the following remarkable property: if it starts from $Y_0 = \{I\}$, then at time n, the event $\{Y_n = \delta\}$ has probability q_δ^n.

In this purpose we define the following transition matrix $P = (P_{\delta,\delta'} : \delta, \delta' \in \partial(\mathcal{T}))$. First we put $P_{\delta,\delta'} = 0$ when $\delta \not\to \delta'$.

To define the transition probability $P_{\delta,\delta'}$ when $\delta \to \delta'$ it is useful to introduce the following notation: for each leaf $\ell \in \delta$ we denote by $\{\ell_1, \ell_2\}$ its corresponding dyadic partition in δ'. We can either have $\{\ell_1, \ell_2\} = \{\ell\}$ that

is $\ell_1 = \ell_2 = \ell$ which means $\ell \in \delta \cap \delta'$; or $\{\ell_1, \ell_2\} \in \mathbb{D}_2(\ell)$ is an strictly dyadic partition of ℓ and in this case $\ell \in \delta \setminus \delta'$. We define

$$\forall \delta, \delta' \in \partial(\mathcal{T}), \delta \to \delta' : \; P_{\delta,\delta'} = \prod_{\ell \in \delta} f^\ell(\{\ell_1, \ell_2\}) = \left(\prod_{\ell \in \delta \cap \delta'} \rho_\ell^\ell \right) \left(\prod_{\ell \in \delta \setminus \delta'} (\rho_{\ell_1}^\ell + \rho_{\ell_2}^\ell) \right). \tag{28}$$

In particular

$$\forall \delta \in \partial(\mathcal{T}) : \; P_{\delta,\delta} = \prod_{\ell \in \delta} \rho_\ell^\ell. \tag{29}$$

Lemma 5.1. *P is an stochastic transition matrix, that is*

$$\forall \delta \in \partial(\mathcal{T}) : \quad \sum_{\delta' \in \partial(\mathcal{T}) : \delta \to \delta'} P_{\delta,\delta'} = 1.$$

Proof. We will use the following decomposition: $\delta = (\delta \cap \mathcal{D}^\rho) \cup (\delta \setminus \mathcal{D}^\rho)$, so the atoms of δ are partitioned according to the fact that if they belong or not to $\mathcal{D}^\rho$. We recall that $\mathbb{D}_2(\ell)$ excludes the partition $\{\ell\}$. For $U \subseteq \delta \setminus \mathcal{D}^\rho$ denote

$$\mathcal{D}(U,2) = \{((K_1^\ell, K_2^\ell) : \ell \in U) \in \prod_{\ell \in U} \mathbb{D}_2(\ell) : \forall \ell \in U, \exists J \in \mathcal{J}_\rho, K_1^\ell = \ell \cap J, K_2^\ell = \ell \cap J^c\}.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\delta' : \delta \to \delta'} P_{\delta,\delta'} &= \left(\prod_{\ell \in \delta \cap \mathcal{D}^\rho} \rho_\ell^\ell \right) \times \left(\sum_{U \subseteq \delta \setminus \mathcal{D}^\rho} \left(\prod_{\ell \in U^c} \rho_\ell^\ell \right) \left(\sum_{((K_1^\ell, K_2^\ell) : \ell \in U) \in \mathcal{D}(U,2)} \prod_{\ell \in U} (\rho_{K_1^\ell}^\ell + \rho_{K_2^\ell}^\ell) \right) \right) \\ &= \sum_{U \subseteq \delta \setminus \mathcal{D}^\rho} \left(\prod_{\ell \in U} \rho_\ell^\ell \right) \left(\sum_{((K_1^\ell, K_2^\ell) : \ell \in U) \in \mathcal{D}(U,2)} \prod_{\ell \in U} (\rho_{K_1^\ell}^\ell + \rho_{K_2^\ell}^\ell) \right). \end{aligned}$$

This last equality uses $\rho_\ell^\ell = 1$ when $\ell \in \mathcal{D}^\rho$, see (16) in Lemma 3.6 (ii). By using notation $f^\ell(\gamma_\ell)$ introduced in (17) we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\delta' : \delta \to \delta'} P_{\delta,\delta'} &= \sum_{(\gamma^\ell : \ell \in \delta \setminus \mathcal{D}^\rho) \in \prod\limits_{\ell \in \delta \setminus \mathcal{D}^\rho} \mathbb{D}_{1,2}(\ell)} \prod_{\ell \in \delta \setminus \mathcal{D}^\rho} f^\ell(\gamma_\ell) \\ &= \prod_{\ell \in \delta \setminus \mathcal{D}^\rho} \left(\sum_{\gamma_\ell \in \mathbb{D}_{1,2}(\ell)} f^\ell(\gamma_\ell) \right) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

In this last equality we use (18). □

Remark 5.2. *From the positive properties of coefficients ρ_M^K we get that $P_{\delta,\delta'} > 0$ if and only if $\delta \to \delta'$. Since there exists a path $\delta_1 = \{I\} \to ... \to \delta_k = \delta$ for all $\delta \in \partial(\mathcal{T})$, $\delta \neq \{I\}$, this path has positive probability.*

Let $Y = (Y_n : n \geq 0)$ be the Markov chain taking values in $\partial(\mathcal{T})$ defined by the transition stochastic matrix P. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ be the measurable space with $\Omega = \partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathbb{F}$ the product $\sigma-$field. Let $(\mathbb{P}_\delta : \delta \in \partial(\mathcal{T}))$ be the family of probability Markov measures on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$, all of them with transition matrix P, and $\mathbb{P}_\delta$ starting from δ. We will simply note $\mathbb{P} := \mathbb{P}_{\{I\}}$, because most of the time the chain will assume to start from $Y_0 = \{I\}$, and this will be clear from the context or the notation. The mean expected values associated to $\mathbb{P}_\delta$ and $\mathbb{P}$ are noted by $\mathbb{E}_\delta$ and $\mathbb{E}$, respectively.

The Markov chain $(Y_n : n \geq 0)$ can be also constructed from a probability space $(\widetilde{\Omega}, \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}, \mathbf{P})$ containing an independent family of random variables $\left(\delta_n^K : K \in \mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{J}_\rho), n \geq 1\right)$, where δ_n^K takes values in $\mathbb{D}_{1,2}(K)$ and

$$\mathbf{P}(\delta_n^K = \delta) = f_\delta^K,$$

where f_δ^K was defined in (17). Thus, the random variables $(\delta_n^K : n \geq 1)$ are independent and identically distributed with law $f_\bullet^K$. It is easily checked that the random sequence given by

$$Y_0 = \delta, \;\; Y_n = (\delta_n^K : K \in Y_{n-1}) \;\; \forall n \geq 1,$$

defines a Markov chain (Y_n) starting from δ, and transition probability given by (28).

Let us show that the Markov chain (Y_n) fulfills the first claim of this section: after $n-$steps of time the probability of the event $\{Y_n = \delta\}$ is the weight of all the trees of length j whose set of leaves is δ.

Lemma 5.3. *For every $n \geq 0$ and $\delta \in \partial(\mathcal{T})$ it holds $\mathbb{P}(Y_n = \delta) = q_\delta^n$.*

Proof. We will use a recurrence argument. For $n = 0$ the property holds because $Y_0 = \{I\}$ and the class of trees of length 0 is the singleton $\mathcal{T}_0 = \{\{I\}\}$. Assume the property holds up to n let us show it for $n+1$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(Y_{n+1} = \delta') &= \sum_{\delta \in \partial(\mathcal{T}) : \delta \to \delta'} \mathbb{P}(Y_n = \delta) P_{\delta,\delta'} \\
&= \sum_{\delta \in \partial(\mathcal{T}) : \delta \to \delta'} q_\delta^n \left(\prod_{\ell \in \delta \cap \delta'} \rho_\ell^\ell \right) \left(\prod_{\ell \in \delta \setminus \delta'} (\rho_{\ell_1}^\ell + \rho_{\ell_2}^\ell) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Now we use the step (22) of the proof of Lemma 4.1, which allows to get $\mathbb{P}(Y_{n+1} = \delta') = q_{\delta'}^{n+1}$. The result is proven. □

The partition $\mathcal{D}^\rho$ is an absorbing state for the chain (Y_n) because $P_{\mathcal{D}^\rho,\mathcal{D}^\rho} = \prod_{L\in\mathcal{D}^\rho}\rho_L^L = 1$, and so $Y_n = \mathcal{D}^\rho$ implies $Y_{n+k} = \mathcal{D}^\rho$ for all $k \geq 0$.

Let us define the hitting times,

$$\forall B \subseteq \partial(\mathcal{T}): \quad \zeta_B = \inf\{n \geq 0 : Y_n \in B\}.$$

For singletons we simply put,

$$\forall \delta \in \partial(\mathcal{T}): \quad \zeta_\delta = \zeta_{\{\delta\}}.$$

For $\delta = \{I\}$ we have $\mathbb{P}(\zeta_{\{I\}} = 0) = 1$. The random time for attaining $\mathcal{D}^\rho$,

$$\zeta = \zeta_{\mathcal{D}^\rho} = \inf\{n \geq 0 : Y_n = \mathcal{D}^\rho\},$$

is an absorbing time because $Y_{\zeta+n} = \mathcal{D}^\rho$ for all $n \geq 0$.

Since $Y_n(\omega) \in \partial(\mathcal{T})$ we can define the random probability:

$$\forall \omega \in \Omega: \quad \Xi^n[\mu](\omega) = \bigotimes_{K\in Y_n(\omega)} \mu_K.$$

From above discussion and Lemma 3.4 (ii) we find,

$$\forall n \geq 0: \ \ \Xi^{\zeta(\omega)+n}[\mu](\omega) = \bigotimes_{L\in\mathcal{D}^\rho} \mu_L.$$

Remark 5.4. *Note that*

$$\{\Xi^n[\mu] \neq \otimes_{L\in\mathcal{D}^\rho}\} \subseteq \{\zeta > n\} \text{ and so } \mathbb{P}\left(\Xi^n[\mu] \neq \otimes_{L\in\mathcal{D}^\rho}\mu_L\right) \leq \mathbb{P}(\zeta > n). \quad (30)$$

It can be checked that when the spaces I, A_i, $i = 1, .., n$, have sufficiently many points we have the equivalence

$$\left\{\forall \mu \in \mathcal{P}_I : \ \Xi^n[\mu] \neq \otimes_{L\in\mathcal{D}^\rho}\right\} = \{\zeta > n\}.$$

For some particular $\widetilde{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}_I$ the inequality (30) can be strict. For instance, if $\widetilde{\mu} = \otimes_{L\in\mathcal{D}^\rho}\widetilde{\mu}_L$ then $\Xi^n[\widetilde{\mu}](\omega) = \widetilde{\mu}$ for all $n \geq 0$, but $\mathbb{P}(\zeta > 0) = 1$ in the nontrivial case $\mathcal{D}^\rho \neq \{I\}$.

In the next result we show that the random measure $\Xi^n[\mu](\omega)$ converges geometrically to a product measure with the marginals of μ at the atoms of $\mathcal{D}^\rho$. This is controlled with the geometric decay rate of $\mathbb{P}(\zeta > n)$. Also we give the quasi-limiting distribution which results from conditioning to the event $\{\zeta > n\}$ for $n \to \infty$.

We will supply the notions of quasi-limiting distribution (and further of quasi-stationary distributions) in the context of the Markov chain (Y_n). The definition and study of these concepts in the context of finite Markov chains which are irreducible on the non-absorbing states are found in the pioneer work [7] and the continuous time case can be seen in Chapter 3 of monograph [6]. There is a large body of literature on quasi stationary distributions, in particular for extinction in population dynamics and we recommend addressing to [12] for an exhaustive list of references.

We emphasize that (Y_n) is not irreducible on $\partial(\mathcal{T}) \setminus \{\mathcal{D}^\rho\}$, because when (Y_n) exits from some state it does never return to it. In fact, $\delta_1 \to \delta_2 \to ... \to \delta_k$ and $\delta_k \neq \delta_1$ implies $\delta_k \not\to \delta_1$ (see Remark 4.3). Therefore, we cannot apply Perron-Frobenius theory which is in the theoretical basis of the main results of quasi-stationary distributions on finite Markov chains. So, we need to develop new elements to describe the quasi-limiting behavior and in particular the geometric decay rate.

In this purpose we introduce a class of distinguished partitions in $\partial(\mathcal{T})$. Any $K \in \mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{J}_\rho)$ defines the partition

$$\mathcal{D}^{\rho,K} = \{L \in \mathcal{D}^\rho : L \cap J = \emptyset\} \cup \{K\}.$$

So, the partition $\mathcal{D}^{\rho,K}$ has the same atoms as $\mathcal{D}^\rho$ when they do not intersect K, and all the other atoms collapse into the unique atom $K \in \mathcal{D}^{\rho,K}$. For $a \in [0,1]$ define the following classes of sets and partitions,

$$\mathcal{E}(a) = \{K \in \mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{J}_\rho) : \rho_K^K = a\} \text{ and } \partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}(a)} = \{\mathcal{D}^{\rho,K} : K \in \mathcal{E}(a)\}. \quad (31)$$

Note that $\mathcal{E}(a)$ and so $\partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}(a)}$ can be empty. When $a = 1$ we have $\mathcal{E}(1) = \mathcal{D}^\rho$ and $\partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}(1)} = \{\mathcal{D}^\rho\}$. When $\rho_I > 0$ we have $\mathcal{E}(\rho_I) = \{I\}$ and $\partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}(\rho_I)} = \{\{I\}\}$.

Theorem 5.5. *Assume $\rho_I < 1$. Then,*

$$\mathbb{P}(\zeta < \infty) = 1. \quad (32)$$

Define

$$\eta = \max\{\rho_K^K : K \in \mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{J}_\rho), K \notin \mathcal{D}^\rho\}.$$

Then $\eta \in (0,1)$. Let

$$\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}(\eta), \quad \partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}} = \partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}(\eta)}, \quad \zeta^{\mathcal{E}} = \zeta_{\partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}}}. \quad (33)$$

Then $0 < \mathbb{P}(\zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty) < 1$ *and the geometric rate of decay of* $\mathbb{P}(\zeta > n)$ *satisfies,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \eta^{-n}\mathbb{P}(\zeta>n) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \eta^{-n}\mathbb{P}(\zeta>n, Y_n\in\partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}}) = \mathbb{E}\left(\eta^{-\zeta^{\mathcal{E}}},\, \zeta^{\mathcal{E}}<\infty\right)\in(0,\infty). \tag{34}$$

The quasi-limiting distribution on $\partial(\mathcal{T})\setminus\{\mathcal{D}^\rho\}$ *is given by,*

$$\begin{aligned} \forall\delta\in\partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}}: \qquad & \lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{P}(Y_n=\delta\,|\,\zeta>n) = \frac{\mathbb{E}\left(\eta^{-\zeta_\delta},\,\zeta_\delta<\infty\right)}{\mathbb{E}\left(\eta^{-\zeta^{\mathcal{E}}},\,\zeta^{\mathcal{E}}<\infty\right)}, \\ \forall\delta\in\partial(\mathcal{T})\setminus\partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}}: \qquad & \lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{P}(Y_n=\delta\,|\,\zeta>n) = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

Furthermore, we have the following ratio limit relation for $\delta\in\partial(\mathcal{T})\setminus\{\mathcal{D}^\rho\}$*,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{\mathbb{P}_\delta(\zeta>n)}{\mathbb{P}(\zeta>n)} = \frac{\mathbb{E}_\delta(\eta^{-\zeta^{\mathcal{E}}},\zeta^{\mathcal{E}}<\infty)}{\mathbb{E}(\eta^{-\zeta^{\mathcal{E}}},\zeta^{\mathcal{E}}<\infty)}. \tag{36}$$

Both ratios vanish only when $\mathbb{P}_\delta(\zeta^{\mathcal{E}}<\infty)=0$*. Finally, the vector*

$$\varphi = (\varphi_\delta : \delta\in\partial(\mathcal{T})\setminus\{\mathcal{D}^\rho\}) \text{ with } \varphi_\delta = \mathbb{E}_\delta(\eta^{-\zeta^{\mathcal{E}}},\zeta^{\mathcal{E}}<\infty), \tag{37}$$

is a right eigenvector of the restriction of P *to* $\partial(\mathcal{T})\setminus\{\mathcal{D}^\rho\}$*, and it has eigenvalue* η*.*

Proof. It is obvious that $\eta>0$ and from (16) in Lemma 3.6 (ii) we have $\eta<1$. Then $\mathcal{E}\cap\mathcal{D}^\rho=\emptyset$ because $K\in\mathcal{E}$ and $L\in\mathcal{D}^\rho$ imply $\rho^K_K=\eta<1=\rho^L_L$. Note that if $\delta=D^{\rho,K}$ then $P_{\delta,\delta}=\rho^K_K$. Hence

$$\forall\delta\in\partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}}: \quad P_{\delta,\delta}=\eta. \tag{38}$$

We claim that

$$\max\{P_{\delta,\delta}:\delta\in\partial(\mathcal{T}),\delta\neq\mathcal{D}^\rho\}=\eta.$$

This follows from (38) for partitions having at most one atom that is not in $\mathcal{D}^\rho$, and if $\delta'\in\partial(\mathcal{T})$ has at least two different atoms K,K' that are not elements of $\mathcal{D}^\rho$, from (29) we get $P_{\delta',\delta'}\le\eta^2$.

Let

$$\beta_0 = \max\{P_{\delta,\delta}:\delta\in\partial(\mathcal{T}),\delta\neq\mathcal{D}^\rho,\delta\notin\partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}}\}. \tag{39}$$

We have

$$\beta_0\le\max\{\beta,\eta^2\}<\eta \text{ where } \beta=\sup\{\rho^K_K : K\in\mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{J}_\rho),\rho^K_K<\eta\}. \tag{40}$$

In fact, when $K \notin \mathcal{E} \cup \{D^\rho\}$ we have $P_{\mathcal{D}^\rho,K,\mathcal{D}^\rho,K} = \rho_K^K \leq \beta$ and if a partition has at least two different atoms K, K' that are not in $\mathcal{D}^\rho$, then $P_{\delta',\delta'} \leq \eta^2$. Then, (40) is shown.

Let us show (32). We use that when (Y_n) exits from some state it does never return to it and inequality $P_{\delta,\delta} < 1$ for $\delta \neq \mathcal{D}^\rho$. In fact, they allow us to prove that the Markov chain (Y_n) visits every state $\delta \neq \mathcal{D}^\rho$ only a finite number of times $\mathbb{P}-$a.s.,

$$\forall \delta \in \partial(\mathcal{T}), \delta \neq \mathcal{D}^\rho : \quad \mathbb{P}(\#\{n : Y_n = \delta\} < \infty) = 1.$$

Then, by using that $\mathcal{D}^\rho$ is an absorbing state, we obtain (32),

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists n : Y_n = \mathcal{D}^\rho) = \mathbb{P}(\zeta < \infty) = 1.$$

The existence of paths from $\{I\}$ to $\partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}}$ with positive probability gives $\mathbb{P}(\zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty) > 0$. On the other hand there exists $\delta' \in \partial(\mathcal{T})$ with $\delta' \to \mathcal{D}^\rho$ and $\#\{J \in \delta' : J \notin \mathcal{D}^\rho\} > 1$. The existence of some path from $\{I\}$ to δ' with positive probability now gives $\mathbb{P}(\zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty) < 1$. We have shown $\mathbb{P}(\zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty) \in (0, 1)$.

Let us now turn to the proof of relations (34), (35) and (36). We have

$$\forall\, \delta \in \partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}},\, j \geq 0 : \quad \delta \to \delta' \Leftrightarrow \left[\, \delta' = \delta \vee \delta' = \mathcal{D}^\rho \right]. \tag{41}$$

Then, the definition of $\mathcal{E}$ and $\partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}}$ in (33) and the fact that $\mathcal{D}^\rho$ is absorbing, allow us to get

$$\forall n \geq 0,\, \delta \in \partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}} : \quad \mathbb{P}_\delta(Y_n = \delta) = \eta^n.$$

We have

$$\mathbb{P}(\zeta > n) = \mathbb{P}(\zeta > n, Y_n \notin \partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}}) + \mathbb{P}(\zeta > n, Y_n \in \partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}}). \tag{42}$$

Since $P_{\delta,\delta'} > 0$ when $\delta \to \delta'$ and there exists paths of positive probability from $\{I\}$ to $\delta \in \partial(\mathcal{T})$, $\delta \neq \{I\}$ (see Remark 5.2), we obtain the existence of $k_0 \geq 1$ such that

$$\forall\, K \in \mathcal{E} : \quad \mathbb{P}(\zeta_{\mathcal{D}^\rho,K} \leq k_0) > 0.$$

So,

$$\alpha(\mathcal{E}) := \min\{\mathbb{P}(\zeta^{\mathcal{D}^\rho,K} \leq k_0) : K \in \mathcal{E}\} > 0.$$

Then, from the Markov property we get,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\zeta > n) &\geq \sum_{j=1}^{k_0} \mathbb{P}(\zeta^{\mathcal{D}^{\rho,K}} = j, \zeta > n) \\
&\geq \sum_{j=1}^{k_0} \mathbb{P}(\zeta^{\mathcal{D}^{\rho,K}} = j)\mathbb{P}_{D^{\rho,K}}(\zeta > n-j) \\
&\geq \sum_{j=1}^{k_0} \mathbb{P}(\zeta^{\mathcal{D}^{\rho,K}} = j)\mathbb{P}_{D^{\rho,K}}(Y_{n-j} = D^{\rho,K}) \\
&\geq \sum_{j=1}^{k_0} \mathbb{P}(\zeta^{\mathcal{D}^{\rho,K}} = j)\eta^{n-j} \\
&\geq \alpha(\mathcal{E})\eta^n. \qquad (43)
\end{aligned}$$

To analyze the first term at the right hand side of equality (42) it will useful to first prove the following result, which uses the quantity β_0 defined (39) which satisfies $\beta_0 < \eta < 1$, see (40).

Lemma 5.6. *We have,*

$$\forall\, \theta > 0\, \exists C' = C'(\theta): \quad \mathbb{P}(\forall j \leq n:\ Y_j \notin (\partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}} \cup \{\mathcal{D}^{\rho}\}) \leq C'(\beta_0 + \theta)^n. \quad (44)$$

Proof of Lemma 5.6. Let $U = \partial(\mathcal{T}) \setminus (\partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}} \cup \{\mathcal{D}^{\rho}\})$. Put $\delta_1 = \{I\}$. For every $s \geq 1$ denote by

$$\mathcal{C}(U,s) = \{(\delta_1, .., \delta_s) \in U^s : \forall r \leq s-1,\ \delta_r \to \delta_{r+1} \text{ and } \delta_r \neq \delta_{r+1}\}.$$

(So, $P_{\delta_r,\delta_{r+1}} > 0$ for all $r = 1, .., s-1$, see Remark 5.2). We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}(\forall j \leq n:\ Y_j \in U) \\
&= \sum_{s \geq 1} \sum_{(\delta_1,..,\delta_s) \in \mathcal{C}(U,s)} \prod_{r=1}^{s-1} P_{\delta_r,\delta_{r+1}} \left(\sum_{k_1,..,k_s \geq 0: \sum_{r=1}^{s} k_r = n-s} P_{\delta_r,\delta_r}^{k_r} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

When $(\delta_1, .., \delta_s) \in \mathcal{C}(U,s)$ we have that every δ_k with $k \leq s$ satisfies $P_{\delta_k,\delta_k} \leq \beta_0$. On the other hand,

$$\#\{(k_1, .., k_s) : \forall r \leq s,\ k_r \geq 0;\ \sum_{r=1}^{s} k_r = n-s\} = \binom{n-1}{s}.$$

Then,

$$\mathbb{P}(\forall j \leq n:\ Y_j \in U) \leq \sum_{s \geq 1} \binom{n-1}{s} \beta_0^{n-s} \left(\sum_{(\delta_1,..,\delta_s) \in \mathcal{C}(U,s)} \prod_{r=0}^{s-1} P_{\delta_r,\delta_{r+1}} \right).$$

We claim that there exists a constant k^* such that $\mathcal{C}(U,s) \neq \emptyset$ implies $s \leq k^*$. Let us show it. Fix an atom $L \in \mathcal{D}^\rho$. Let $(K_n : n \geq 1)$ be a sequence of sets constructed in an inductive way and satisfying the following properties: $K_1 = I$; $L \subseteq K_n$ for all n; $K_{n+1} = K_n \cap J_n$ for some $J_n \in \mathcal{J}_\rho$ and $K_{n+1} \subset K_n$ for all n. Then, after a number n_0 of steps bounded by $\#I - \#L - 1$ one necessarily has $K_{n_0} = L$ and the construction is stopped. Now, define $k^* = \sum_{L \in \mathcal{D}^\rho} (\#I - \#L - 1)$. A consequence of the above argument is that the existence of some $(\delta_1, .., \delta_s) \in \mathcal{C}(U,s)$ implies $s \leq k^*$. So,

$$C_1 = \sum_{s \geq 1} \sum_{(\delta_1,..,\delta_s) \in \mathcal{C}(U,s)} \prod_{r=0}^{s-1} P_{\delta_r, \delta_{r+1}} < \infty.$$

On the other hand, for $\theta' \in (0,1)$ we have

$$C_2(\theta') = \max_{s \leq k^*} \sup_{n \geq 1} \binom{n-1}{s} (1-\theta')^{n-k^*} < \infty.$$

Then

$$\mathbb{P}(\forall j \leq n : \; Y_j \in U) \leq C_1 \cdot C_2(\theta') \beta_0^{n-k^*} / (1-\theta')^{n-k^*}.$$

So by taking $\theta' \in (0,1)$ such that $\beta_0/(1-\theta') < \beta_0 + \theta$ we get that the constant

$$C' = (\beta_0 + \theta)^{-k^*} C_1 \cdot C_2(\theta')$$

makes the job in (44). $\square$

Continuation with the proof of Theorem 5.5.

In (44) we will always take $\theta > 0$ such that $\beta_0 + \theta < \eta$. Hence, from (43) and (44) we find,

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_n \notin \partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}} \,|\, \zeta > n) \leq C'' \left((\beta_0 + \theta)/\eta\right)^n \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty, \tag{45}$$

with $C'' = C'/\alpha(\mathcal{E})$. Therefore,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}(Y_n \in \partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}} \,|\, \zeta > n) = 1. \tag{46}$$

Let us examine the second term at the right hand side of equality (42). For

every $K \in \mathcal{E}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\zeta > n, Y_n = D^{\rho,K}) &= \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{P}(\zeta > n, \zeta_{D^{\rho,K}} = j) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{P}(\zeta_{D^{\rho,K}} = j) \mathbb{P}_{D^{\rho,K}}(\zeta > n - j) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{P}(\zeta_{D^{\rho,K}} = j) \eta^{n-j} \\
&= \eta^n \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \eta^{-j} \mathbb{P}(\zeta_{D^{\rho,K}} = j) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\zeta_{D^{\rho,K}} = j) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\zeta^{\mathcal{E}} = j) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}(\forall n \leq j-1 : \; Y_n \notin (\partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}}) \cup \{\mathcal{D}^{\rho}\}) \leq C'(\beta_0 + \theta)^{j-1},
\end{aligned}$$

and $\beta_0 + \epsilon < \eta$, we get

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \eta^{-j} \mathbb{P}(\zeta_{D^{\rho,K}} = j) < \infty.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\forall K \in \mathcal{E} : \; \lim_{n \to \infty} \eta^{-n} \mathbb{P}(\zeta > n, Y_n = D^{\rho,K}) &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \eta^{-j} \mathbb{P}(\zeta_{D^{\rho,K}} = j) \qquad (47) \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left(\eta^{-\zeta_{D^{\rho,K}}}, \zeta_{D^{\rho,K}} < \infty\right) < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\zeta_{D^{\rho,K}} < \infty \Rightarrow \left[\forall K' \in \mathcal{E} \setminus \{K\} : \; \zeta_{D^{\rho,K}} = \infty \text{ and } \zeta^{\mathcal{E}} = \zeta_{D^{\rho,K}} \right].$$

Then,

$$\{\zeta^{\mathcal{E}} = j\} = \bigcup_{K \in \mathcal{E}} \{\zeta_{D^{\rho,K}} = j\}$$

and the union is disjoint. Hence,

$$\eta^{-\zeta^{\mathcal{E}}} \mathbf{1}_{\zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty} = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{E}} \eta^{-\zeta_{D^{\rho,K}}} \mathbf{1}_{\zeta_{D^{\rho,K}} < \infty}.$$

Then,

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\eta^{-\zeta^{\mathcal{E}}}, \zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty\right) = \sum_{K\in\mathcal{E}} \mathbb{E}\left(\eta^{-\zeta_{D^\rho,K}}, \zeta_{D^\rho,K} < \infty\right) < \infty.$$

Hence, from (47), we deduce

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \eta^{-n}\mathbb{P}(\zeta > n, Y_n \in \partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}}) = \mathbb{E}\left(\eta^{-\zeta^{\mathcal{E}}}, \zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty\right). \tag{48}$$

Then, relations (45), (47) and (48), give (35).

Now, relation (34) is a consequence of relations (46) and (48) because they imply

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{n\to\infty} \eta^{-n}\mathbb{P}(\zeta > n) &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \eta^{-n}\mathbb{P}(\zeta > n, Y_n \in \partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(\eta^{-\zeta^{\mathcal{E}}}, \zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty) \in (0,\infty).\end{aligned}$$

Let us show (36). First, assume δ is such that $\mathbb{P}_\delta(\zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty) > 0$. Since there is a path with positive probability from δ to some nonempty subset of $\partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}}$, a similar proof as the one showing (34) gives that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \eta^{-n}\mathbb{P}_\delta(\zeta > n) = \mathbb{E}_\delta(\eta^{-\zeta^{\mathcal{E}}}, \zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty) \in (0,\infty),$$

and so the relation (36) is satisfied. Now, let $\mathbb{P}_\delta(\zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty) = 0$. Then, $\mathbb{E}_\delta(\eta^{-\zeta^{\mathcal{E}}}, \zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty) = 0$ and in (36) we have $\mathbb{E}_\delta(\eta^{-\zeta^{\mathcal{E}}}, \zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty)/\mathbb{E}(\eta^{-\zeta^{\mathcal{E}}}, \zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty) = 0$. We claim that in this case we also have $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_\delta(\zeta > n)/\mathbb{P}(\zeta > n) = 0$. In fact, $\mathbb{P}_\delta(\zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty) = 0$ implies

$$\begin{aligned}(\beta_0+\theta)^{-n}\mathbb{P}_\delta(\zeta > n) &= (\beta_0+\theta)^{-n}\mathbb{P}_\delta(\zeta > n, \zeta^{\mathcal{E}} > n) \\ &= (\beta_0+\theta)^{-n}\mathbb{P}(\forall j \le n : Y_j \notin (\partial(T)^{\mathcal{E}} \cup \{\mathcal{D}^\rho\}) < \infty.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\lim_{n\to\infty} \eta^{-n}\mathbb{P}(\zeta > n) > 0$ and $\beta_0 + \theta < \eta$, the claim follows and (36) is shown.

Now, let P^* be the restriction of P to $\partial(\mathcal{T})^*$. The last statement we must show is that the vector φ defined in (37) is a right eigenvector of P^* with eigenvalue η. First take $\delta \in \partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}}$. We have $\mathbb{P}_\delta(\zeta^{\mathcal{E}} = 0) = 1$ and so $\mathbb{E}_\delta(\eta^{-\zeta^{\mathcal{E}}}, \zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty) = 1$. Since $P_{\delta,\delta'} > 0$ and $\delta' \neq D^\rho$ imply $\delta' = \delta$, from $P_{\delta,\delta} = \eta$ we get

$$(P^*\varphi)_\delta = \sum_{\delta':\delta'\neq D^\rho, \delta\to\delta'} P_{\delta,\delta'}\mathbb{E}_{\delta'}(\eta^{-\zeta^{\mathcal{E}}}, \zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty) = \eta = \eta\,\varphi_\delta.$$

Now let δ be such that $\mathbb{P}_\delta(\zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty) = 0$, so $\varphi_\delta = 0$. Then $P_{\delta,\delta'} > 0$ implies $\mathbb{P}_{\delta'}(\zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty) = 0$ and so $(P^*\varphi)_\delta = 0 = \eta\,\varphi_\delta$.

Now take $\delta \notin \partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}}$ with $\mathbb{P}_\delta(\zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty) > 0$. Then, from the Markov property we get,

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_\delta &= \mathbb{E}_\delta(\eta^{-\zeta^{\mathcal{E}}}, \zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty) = \sum_{\delta':\delta'\neq D^\rho,\delta\to\delta'} \mathbb{E}_\delta(\eta^{-\zeta^{\mathcal{E}}}, \zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty, Y_1 = \delta') \\ &= \sum_{\delta':\delta'\neq D^\rho,\delta\to\delta'} P_{\delta,\delta'}\,\eta^{-1}\,\mathbb{E}_{\delta'}(\eta^{-\zeta^{\mathcal{E}}}, \zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty) = \eta^{-1}\,(P^*\varphi)_\delta.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the result is shown. This finishes the proof of the theorem. □

We will get two results from Theorem 5.5. In the first one we supply the $Q-$process, which is the Markov chain that avoids some forbidden region, in our case the singleton $\{\otimes_{L\in\mathcal{D}^\rho}\mu_L\}$. In the second one we give a class of quasi-stationary distributions, that must be compared with the irreducible case where there is a unique one. The $Q-$process in branching process was introduced in Section I.D.14 in [1]. In [6] it can be found the construction of the $Q-$process for Markov chains and dynamical systems.

In the sequel it is convenient to denote by $\partial(\mathcal{T})^* = \partial(\mathcal{T}) \setminus \{D^\rho\}$ and by P^* the restriction of P to $\partial(\mathcal{T})^*$.

Corollary 5.7. *The following limit exists*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}(Y_i = \delta_i, i = 1,..,j \,|\, \zeta > n)$$

for all $\delta_i \in \partial(\mathcal{T}) \setminus \{D^\rho\}$, $i = 1,..,k$, and it vanishes if some δ_i satisfies $\mathbb{P}_{\delta_i}(\zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty) = 0$.

Denote

$$\partial(\zeta^{\mathcal{E}}) = \{\delta \in \partial(\mathcal{T})^* : \mathbb{P}_\delta(\zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty) > 0\}.$$

Then, the matrix $Q = \big(Q_{\delta,\delta'} : \delta,\delta' \in \partial(\zeta^{\mathcal{E}})\big)$ given by

$$Q_{\delta,\delta'} = \eta^{-1}\,P_{\delta,\delta'}\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\delta'}(\eta^{\zeta^{\mathcal{E}}}, \zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty)}{\mathbb{E}_\delta(\eta^{\zeta^{\mathcal{E}}}, \zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty)},$$

is an stochastic matrix on $\partial(\zeta^{\mathcal{E}})$, and it is satisfied

$$\forall \delta_i \in \partial(\zeta^{\mathcal{E}}), i = 0,..,j: \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_{\delta_0}(Y_i = \delta_i, i = 1,..,j \,|\, \zeta > n) = \prod_{i=0}^{j-1} Q_{\delta_i,\delta_{i+1}}.$$

That is, Q is the transition matrix of the Markov chain that never hits $\otimes_{L\in\mathcal{D}^\rho}\mu_L$.

Proof. Let us prove that Q is an stochastic matrix. Let φ be the right eigenvector of P^* with eigenvalue η^{-1} given in (37). We have that φ_δ vanishes when $\mathbb{P}_\delta(\zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty) = 0$. Let $\delta \in \partial(\zeta^{\mathcal{E}})$. We will use that $P_{\delta,\delta'} = 0$ if $\delta \not\to \delta'$ and that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\delta'}(\zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty) = 0 \text{ implies } \frac{\varphi_{\delta'}}{\varphi_\delta} = \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\delta'}(\eta^{\zeta^{\mathcal{E}}}, \zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty)}{\mathbb{E}_\delta(\eta^{\zeta^{\mathcal{E}}}, \zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty)} = 0.$$

Hence

$$\sum_{\delta' \in \partial(\zeta^{\mathcal{E}})} Q_{\delta,\delta'} = \eta^{-1} \left(\sum_{\delta' \in \partial(\zeta^{\mathcal{E}})} P_{\delta,\delta'} \frac{\varphi_{\delta'}}{\varphi_\delta} \right) = \eta^{-1} \left(\sum_{\delta' \in \partial(\mathcal{T})^*} P_{\delta,\delta'} \frac{\varphi_{\delta'}}{\varphi_\delta} \right) = 1.$$

The last equality because φ is a right eigenvector with eigenvalue η. Now, from the Markov property we obtain for $n > j$,

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_i = \delta_i, i = 1, .., j \,|\, \zeta > n) = \mathbb{P}(Y_i = \delta_i, i = 1, .., j) \frac{\mathbb{P}_{\delta_j}(\zeta > n - j)}{\mathbb{P}(\zeta > n)}.$$

Now we use the ratio limit result (36). This limit vanishes if $\mathbb{P}_{\delta_j}(\zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty) = 0$. Also it vanishes when $\mathbb{P}_{\delta_i}(\zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty) = 0$ for some $i < j$ because $P_{\delta_i,\delta_{i+1}} > 0$ implies $\mathbb{P}_{\delta_{i+1}}(\zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty) = 0$.

Finally, let $\delta_i \in \partial(\zeta^{\mathcal{E}})$ for $i = 0, .., j$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_{\delta_0}(Y_i = \delta_i, i = 1, .., j \,|\, \zeta > n) \\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_{\delta_0}(Y_i = \delta_i, i = 1, .., j) \frac{\mathbb{P}_{\delta_j}(\zeta > n - j)}{\mathbb{P}_{\delta_0}(\zeta > n)} \\
&= \mathbb{P}_{\delta_0}(Y_i = \delta_i, i = 1, .., j) \frac{\varphi_{\delta_j}}{\varphi_{\delta_0}} \eta^{-j} \qquad (49) \\
&= \prod_{l=0}^{j-1} \left(\eta^{-1} P_{\delta_l,\delta_{l+1}} \frac{\varphi_{\delta_{l+1}}}{\varphi_{\delta_l}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

In (49) we used $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}(\zeta > n - j)/\mathbb{P}(\zeta > n) = \eta^{-j}$, which is a consequence of (34). Then the result follows. □

Let $\nu = (\nu_\delta : \delta \in \partial(\mathcal{T})^*)$ be a probability measure on $\partial(\mathcal{T})^*$. If necessary, ν will be identified with its extension on $\partial(\mathcal{T})$ with $\nu_{D^\rho} = 0$. We say that ν is supported by some subset $\widetilde{\partial} \subseteq \partial(\mathcal{T})^*$ if $\nu(\widetilde{\partial}) = 1$. We denote by ν' the row vector associated to ν.

Corollary 5.8. *Every probability measure ν on $\partial(\mathcal{T})^*$ supported on $\partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}}$ satisfies $\nu' P^* = \eta\,\nu'$ and it is a quasi-stationary distribution, that is it satisfies*

$$\forall n \geq 1,\, \forall \delta \in \partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}}: \quad \mathbb{P}_\nu(Y_n = \delta \,|\, \zeta > n) = \nu_\delta. \tag{50}$$

Moreover, if for some $a \leq \eta$ we have $\mathcal{E}(a) = \{K \in \mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{J}_\rho) : \rho_K^K = a\} \neq \emptyset$, then any probability measure $\widetilde{\nu}$ supported on $\partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}(a)} = \{\mathcal{D}^{\rho,K} : K \in \mathcal{E}(a)\}$ satisfies $\widetilde{\nu}' P^* = a\,\widetilde{\nu}'$ and it is a quasi-stationary distribution,

$$\forall n \geq 1,\, \forall \delta \in \partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}(a)}: \quad \mathbb{P}_{\widetilde{\nu}}(Y_n = \delta \,|\, \zeta > n) = \widetilde{\nu}_\delta. \tag{51}$$

Proof. With the above notation and by using (41) we get,

$$(\nu' P^*)_\delta = P_{\delta,\delta}\,\nu_\delta = \eta\,\nu_\delta,$$

so $\nu' P^* = \eta\nu'$. By iteration we find $\nu' P^{*n} = \eta^n\,\nu'$. Note that this is equivalent to

$$(\nu' P^{*n})_\delta = \mathbb{P}_\nu(Y_n = \delta) = \mathbb{P}_\nu(\forall j \leq n\; Y_j = \delta) = \eta^n\,\nu'_\delta.$$

Now

$$\mathbb{P}_\nu(\zeta > n) = \sum_{\delta \in \partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}}} (\nu' P^{*n})_\delta = \eta^n \left(\sum_{\delta \in \partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}}} \nu_\delta \right) = \eta^n.$$

Hence, relation (50) is proven. The proof of (51) is completely similar. □

This is analogous for positive eigenvectors. Let $\widetilde{\partial} \subseteq \partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}}$ be a nonempty set, then the characteristic function $\mathbf{1}_{\widetilde{\partial}}$ is a right eigenvector of P^* with eigenvalue η. Also, if $\widetilde{\partial} \subseteq \partial(\mathcal{T})^{\mathcal{E}(a)}$ is a nonempty subset for some $a \leq \eta$, then $\mathbf{1}_{\widetilde{\partial}}$ is a right eigenvector of P^* with eigenvalue a. We notice that an analogous of the $Q-$process construction can be written on the class of states δ's that verify $\mathbb{P}_\delta(\zeta^{\mathcal{E}} < \infty)) = 0$ and $\mathbb{P}_\delta(\zeta_{\widetilde{\partial}} < \infty) > 0$, being $\widetilde{\partial} = \{\delta \in \partial(\mathcal{T})^* : P_{\delta,\delta} = \beta_0\}$.

Remark 5.9. *The results we have obtained can be easily extended to general probability spaces. In fact, let $((X_i, \mathcal{B}_i) : i \in I)$ be a finite collection of measurable spaces and $(\prod_{i\in I} X_i, \otimes_{i\in I}\mathcal{B}_i, \mu)$ be a probability space. For $J \in \mathbb{S}$, let $\mathcal{B}_J = \otimes_{i\in J}\mathcal{B}_i$ be the product σ-field on $\prod_{i\in J} X_i$ and μ_J be the marginal on $(\prod_{i\in J} X_j, \mathcal{B}_J)$,*

$$\mu_J(V) = \mu\left(V \times \prod_{i\in I\setminus J} X_j\right) \text{ for } V \in \mathcal{B}_J.$$

Then, introduce the partitions on I as in Sections 2 and 3 and as done in Definition 3.2, for a probability vector $\rho = (\rho_J : J \in \mathbb{S}^{(\emptyset)})$ define $\Xi[\mu] = \rho_I\, \mu + \sum_{J\in\mathbb{S}} \rho_J\, \mu_J \otimes \mu_{J^c}$. Then, all the results of this paper, in particular Theorem 4.2 and Theorem 5.5, can be written in this setting. The unique thing one must take care is to replace the expression $\sum_{x_K \in \prod_{i\in K} A_i} \mu_K(x_K) g(x_k, x_{K^c})$ by $\int_{\prod_{i\in K} X_i} g(x_k, x_{K^c}) d\mu_K$ when it is required, for instance in Lemma 3.7.

Remark 5.10. *The atoms of the partition $\mathcal{D}^\rho$ can always be assumed to be singletons, that is $\mathcal{D}^\rho = \mathcal{D}_{si}$. We have not done it because on one hand, there is no substantial gain in notation, and on the other hand, this can be made only a posteriori because the input is the vector $\rho = (\rho_J : J \in \mathbb{S}^{(\emptyset)})$ and the atoms are obtained once computing the set of nonempty intersections (1) from the support $\mathcal{J}_\rho$, the atoms are the minimal elements, so they satisfy (2).*

Final comment. As already said, all we have done does not require the operation $\otimes$ to be the product between probability measures. As it can be checked, the results can be extended to any operation $\otimes$ defined in the domains (6) that satisfies commutativity, associativity (7), stability under restriction (8) and $\mu_\emptyset$ is the identity element. In particular, commutativity and associativity imply that for any partition the probability measure $\otimes_{K\in\delta}\mu_K$ is well-defined. Obviously, the partition $\otimes_{L\in\mathcal{D}^\rho}\mu_L$ could have a meaning different from a product measure of the marginals on the atoms, but it continue to play the same central role in all our constructions and results.

Acknowledgments. We thank support from the CMM Basal CONICYT Project PB-03. We acknowledge discussions with Dr. Thierry Huillet from CNRS and the hospitality of the Laboratoire de Physique Théorique et Modélisation at the Université de Cergy-Pontoise, where this work was started.

References

[1] K. Athreya, P. Ney. Branching processes, 287 p. Springer Verlag, New York (1972).

[2] E. Baake, M. Baake. An exactly solved solved model for mutation, recombination and selection. Canadian J. Math **55**, p. 3-41 (2003) and Erratum **60**, p. 264-265 (2008).

[3] E. Baake, U. von Wangenheim. Single-crossover recombination and ancestral recombination trees. J. Math. Biol. **68**, No. 6, 1371-1402 (2014).

[4] E. Baake, M. Baake, M. Salamat. The general recombination equation in continuous time and its solution. Discrete and continuous dynamical systems **36**, No. 1, p. 63-95 (2016) and Erratum and addendum **36**, No. 4, 2365-2366 (2016).

[5] J. H. Bennett. On the theory of random mating. Ann. Human. Genet. **18**, p. 311-317 (1954).

[6] P. Collet, S. Martínez and J. San Martín. Quasi-stationary distributions. Markov chains, diffusions and dynamical systems. Collection Probability and its Applications, 280 p., Springer (2013).

[7] J.N. Darroch, E. Seneta. On quasi-stationary distribution in absorbing discrete-time finite Markov chains. Journal of Applied Probability, **2**, p. 88-100 (1965).

[8] K.J. Dawson. The decay of linkage disequilibria under random union of gametes. How to calculate Bennett's principal components. Theor. Popul. Biol. **58**, p. 1-20 (2000).

[9] K.J. Dawson. The evolution of a population under recombination: How to linearise the dynamics. Linear Algebra Appl. **348**, p. 115-137 (2002).

[10] H. Geiringer. On the probability theory of linkage in Mendelian heredity. Ann. Math. Stat. **15**, p. 25-57 (1944).

[11] R. Lande, S. Engen, B. Saether. Stochastic population dynamics in ecology and conservation. Oxford Series in Ecology and Evolution, Oxford University Press, New York (2003).

[12] P. Pollett. Research Communications www.maths.uq.edu.au/ pkp/publist.html.

[13] U. von Wangenheim. Single-crossover recombination and ancestral recombination trees. PhD. Thesis, U. Bielelfeld (2011).

[14] U. von Wangenheim, E. Baake, M. Baake. Single-crossover recombination in discrete time. J. Math. Biol. **60**, No. 5, 727-760 (2010).

SERVET MARTÍNEZ
Departamento Ingeniería Matemática and Centro Modelamiento Matemático, Universidad de Chile, UMI 2807 CNRS, Casilla 170-3, Correo 3, Santiago, Chile. e-mail: smartine@dim.uchile.cl